

## 論文の英語要旨

### 論文題目

Responsibilities of local authorities in the public provision of cultural services:  
A study based on analyses of the Frankfurtarian museum policies since 1970

### 氏名

Yuki AKINO

In this paper, I examine the development of the concept of “Kultur” (culture) and the public cultural policies in Germany. The purpose of this study is to define “kulturelle Daseinsvorsorge” (responsibilities of local authorities in the public provision of cultural services) today by analyzing the Frankfurtarian museum policies since 1970. The term “kulturelle Daseinsvorsorge” refers to the governmental provision of essential cultural services to the general public. Against the background of the depression since the 1990s and the liberalization of public services, the responsibilities of local authorities in the provision of cultural services have received much attention in contemporary society. The provision of public infrastructural facilities, that is, cultural institutions, to the general public is considered to be the main responsibility of the local authorities. However, in this study, I examine whether the current concept of “Kulturelle Daseinsvorsorge” includes “Kulturvermittlung” (mediation of arts) as well. I am founded on the hypothesis that a reason for the frequent discussion of the role of public cultural policies today is the divergence between political perspective and the praxis in the sphere of public cultural policies. In order to reveal the divergence between thought and praxis, I first investigate the origins of the public cultural policies. Then, I examine the development of the cultural political thought in Germany, which was mainly concentrated in Frankfurt am Main, and finally, I examine the actual praxis in the Frankfurt museums and the financial system adopted by the museum policies. By comparing political thought and praxis, I will uncover the divergence between the two, and on the basis of these analyses, I will define the responsibilities of the local authorities in the public provision of cultural services.

In the first part of this paper, I described the origins of public cultural policies and these problems. Next, I examined how the system and thought of the sphere of public cultural policies in Germany since 1970 attempted to overcome the undemocratic character of the theory of the “culture state” (Kulturstaat) and “Daseinsvorsorge” approbated by Ernst Forsthof. I examined these problems by analyzing the closing report of the culture committee enquiring “culture in Germany” 2007 and the political thought of the new cultural policies in the 1970s. Both “culture

state” and “Daseinsvorsorge” indirectly provided the theoretical bases that assign all political powers to the Nazi regime. It was found that the theoretical overcoming of the undemocratic character of the “culture state” lays emphasis on “cultural education” as a means bringing the cultural institute into a cultural public sphere.

In the second part of this study, I investigated how the cultural political thought shaped “cultural education” in Frankfurt am Main since 1970. Since then, Frankfurtarian cultural policies served as a model of local public cultural policies in Germany; this was because of its political thought of “cultural education,” known by the slogan “culture for everybody.” This is why I selected Frankfurt as an appropriate example for this study. I found that Frankfurtarian cultural policies under the motto “culture for everybody” in the sphere of museum policies strove to open up the museums to a wider population. Museum policies in Frankfurt attempted to democratize culture. Through this, Frankfurt tried to allow its people to form individual definitions of culture. “Cultural education” played an important role in this context. However, “cultural education” has been gradually interpreted as “cultural pedagogy” at the praxis level, resulting in a divergence between the cultural political thought and praxis. On one hand, the original intention of cultural political thought was to support the construction of a cultural public sphere by communicating through the medium of culture; on the other hand, the praxis aimed for “cultural pedagogy,” which makes the museum not a place of communication but one of learning. “Cultural pedagogy” aimed mainly to educate the population about artwork at the time. It did not intend to let the museum visitors develop their individualistic perspective of culture; it also did not allow them to construct a cultural public sphere. The concept of “museum educator” was institutionalized until the 1990s in this context. It was neither a result of the development of political thought nor of the museum development plan, but of political intentions after the change in the Frankfurtarian administration in 1977.

In the third part, I investigated the nature of the divergence between the political thought of “culture for everyone” and praxis in the Frankfurt museums, in addition to the financial structure of the museums. It was found that since 2000, the museums and museum policies of the local authority prefer the term “art mediation” to “cultural pedagogy.” Museums today intend to use the term “mediation” to create a cultural public sphere. This shows that the thought of museum policies and the praxis in contemporary society have become closely related. Another possibility to be considered is the divergence—a result of the altered roles and definition of public cultural policies today—derived from another sphere of praxis today, that is, financial structure. The financial resources clearly indicate that the amount of resources allotted to mediators, who let people think independently about culture, are meager. On the other hand, the researchers, who mainly research and provide the people with knowledge of the arts, are better financed. However, the museum policies since 1970 aimed to overcome the structure that museums give more importance to the research rather than the mediation of arts. This led to the institutionalization of “museum pedagogy.” Nevertheless, this financial structure still maintains the museums as places of learning, and it does not support the transformation of the museum into places of communication.

The results of these analyses indicate that the current responsibilities of local authorities in the provision of cultural services to the public is not only providing public infrastructural facilities to the general public but also supporting what is known as “art mediation.” Because there is a key in “art mediation”, that overcome the past of “culture state” and “Nationalsozialismus.” However, at present, there are differences between thought and system in public policies in Frankfurt. It is essential to consider this point when constructing the definition of “kulturelle Daseinsvorsorge.”